

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

RUDY OF THE FAMILY SNEED,

Plaintiff,

v.

PIMA COUNTY DIVISION OF CHILD  
 SUPPORT SERVICES, et al.,

Defendants.

3:20-cv-00348-RCJ-CLB

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**  
**OF U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE<sup>1</sup>**

Before the court is Plaintiff Rudy of the Family Sneed's ("Plaintiff"), application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 1), and his *pro se* civil rights complaint (ECF No. 1-1). For the reasons stated below, the court recommends that Plaintiff's *in forma pauperis* application (ECF No. 1) be granted, and his complaint (ECF No. 1-1) be dismissed, with prejudice.

**I. *IN FORMA PAUPERIS* APPLICATION**

A person may be granted permission to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") if the person "submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets such [person] possesses [and] that the person is unable to pay such fees or give security therefore. Such affidavit shall state the nature of the action, defense or appeal and affiant's belief that the person is entitled to redress." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1); *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1129 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc) (stating 28 U.S.C. § 1915 applies to all actions filed IFP, not just prisoner actions).

The Local Rules of Practice for the District of Nevada provide: "Any person who is unable to prepay the fees in a civil case may apply to the court for authority to proceed [IFP]."

---

<sup>1</sup> This Report and Recommendation is made to the Honorable Robert C. Jones, United States District Judge. The action was referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and LR IB 1-4.

1 The application must be made on the form provided by the court and must include a financial  
2 affidavit disclosing the applicant's income, assets, expenses, and liabilities." LSR 1-1.

3 "[T]he supporting affidavit [must] state the facts as to [the] affiant's poverty with some  
4 particularity, definiteness and certainty." *U.S. v. McQuade*, 647 F.2d 938, 940 (9th Cir.  
5 1981) (quotation marks and citation omitted). A litigant need not "be absolutely destitute to  
6 enjoy the benefits of the statute." *Adkins v. E.I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 335 U.S. 331,  
7 339 (1948).

8 A review of the application to proceed IFP reveals Plaintiff cannot pay the filing fee;  
9 therefore, the court recommends that the application (ECF No. 1) be granted.

## 10 **II. SCREENING STANDARD**

11 Prior to ordering service on any defendant, the Court is required to screen an *in forma*  
12 *pauperis* complaint to determine whether dismissal is appropriate under certain  
13 circumstances. See *Lopez*, 203 F.3d at 1126 (noting the *in forma pauperis* statute at 28  
14 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) requires a district court to dismiss an *in forma pauperis* complaint for  
15 the enumerated reasons). Such screening is required before a litigation proceeding *in forma*  
16 *pauperis* may proceed to serve a pleading. *Glick v. Edwards*, 803 F.3d 505, 507 (9th Cir.  
17 2015).

18 "[T]he court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that – (A) the  
19 allegations of poverty is untrue; or (B) the action or appeal – (i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii)  
20 fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against  
21 a defendant who is immune from such relief." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(A), (B)(i)-(iii).

22 Dismissal of a complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted  
23 is provided for in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), and 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii)  
24 tracks that language. When reviewing the adequacy of a complaint under this statute, the  
25 court applies the same standard as is applied under Rule 12(b)(6). See, e.g., *Watison v.*  
26 *Carter*, 668 F.3d 1108, 1112 (9th Cir. 2012) ("The standard for determining whether a  
27 plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted under § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii)

1 is the same as the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) standard for failure to state a  
 2 claim.”). Review under Rule 12(b)(6) is essentially a ruling on a question of law. See  
 3 *Chappel v. Lab. Corp. of America*, 232 F.3d 719, 723 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted).

4 The Court must accept as true the allegations, construe the pleadings in the light  
 5 most favorable to the plaintiff, and resolve all doubts in the plaintiff’s favor. *Jenkins v.*  
 6 *McKeithen*, 395 U.S. 411, 421 (1969) (citations omitted). Allegations in pro se complaints  
 7 are “held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers[.]” *Hughes v.*  
 8 *Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980) (internal quotations marks and citation omitted).

9 A complaint must contain more than a “formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause  
 10 of actions,” it must contain factual allegations sufficient to “raise a right to relief above the  
 11 speculative level.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). “The pleading  
 12 must contain something more. . . than. . . a statement of facts that merely creates a suspicion  
 13 [of] a legally cognizable right of action.” *Id.* (citation and quotation marks omitted). At a  
 14 minimum, a plaintiff should include “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible  
 15 on its face.” *Id.* at 570; see also *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009).

16 A dismissal should not be without leave to amend unless it is clear from the face of  
 17 the complaint the action is frivolous and could not be amended to state a federal claim, or  
 18 the district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the action. See *Cato v. United States*,  
 19 70 F.3d 1103, 1106 (9th Cir. 1995); *O’Loughlin v. Doe*, 920 F.2d 614, 616 (9th Cir. 1990).

### 20 **III. SCREENING OF COMPLAINT**

21 In his complaint, Plaintiff sues Defendants Pima County Division of Child Support  
 22 Services, Director of the IV-D franchise Heather Noble, and Pima County Superior Court  
 23 under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for what appears to relate to a paternity dispute. (See ECF No. 1-  
 24 1 at 2.) Plaintiff alleges violations of his right to privacy, self-incrimination and due process,  
 25 “takings clause,” and involuntary servitude, as well as claims for fraudulent inducement,  
 26 dissemination of false advertisements, and compelled use of a social security number. (*Id.*  
 27 at 8-9.) Plaintiff asserts that the facts underlying his claims are: “In 1992 and 1994 Rudy’s

1 mate bore his seed at Tucson medical center. Immediately after, hospital paternity staff  
2 entered the room with a clip board and explained that Rudy was required by law to voluntarily  
3 sign the acknowledgement of paternity.” (*Id.* at 9.) Plaintiffs seems to assert that these  
4 acknowledgements of paternity violated his rights. (*Id.* at 10-11.) Plaintiff further alludes to  
5 his wages being withheld, presumably in relation to child support. (*Id.*) Plaintiff seeks  
6 injunctive, declaratory, and monetary relief. (*Id.* at 13-14.)

7 Plaintiff’s complaint is rambling and nonsensical. Dismissal on those grounds alone  
8 is appropriate. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires that a complaint contain “a  
9 short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, in order  
10 to give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.”  
11 *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 (quotation and alteration omitted). Here, Plaintiff’s largely  
12 incomprehensible narrative makes it nearly impossible for the court to identify the factual or  
13 legal basis for his claims. Plaintiff states no claim upon which relief may be granted, and  
14 given the vague nature of the allegations, amendment would be futile. See *Cato*, 70 F.3d  
15 at 1106.

16 Notwithstanding the above, this court lacks subject matter jurisdiction in this case.  
17 See *Buechold v. Ortiz*, 401 F.2d 371, 372 (9th Cir. 1968) (noting federal courts have no  
18 jurisdiction of suits to establish paternity and child support). It is well recognized that federal  
19 courts must decline jurisdiction of cases concerning domestic relations when the primary  
20 issue concerns the status of parent and child. See *id.* (compiling cases).

21 For all of the above, the court recommends the complaint be dismissed, with  
22 prejudice, as amendment would be futile.

#### 23 **IV. CONCLUSION**

24 For the reasons articulated above, the court recommends that Plaintiff’s application  
25 to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 1) be granted, and his complaint (ECF No. 1-1) be  
26 dismissed, with prejudice, as amendment would be futile.

27 The parties are advised:

1           1. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c) and Rule IB 3-2 of the Local Rules of  
2 Practice, the parties may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation  
3 within fourteen days of receipt. These objections should be entitled "Objections to  
4 Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation" and should be accompanied by points  
5 and authorities for consideration by the District Court.

6           2. This Report and Recommendation is not an appealable order and any notice  
7 of appeal pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1) should not be filed until entry of the District  
8 Court's judgment.

9 **V. RECOMMENDATION**

10           **IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED** that Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma*  
11 *pauperis* (ECF No. 1) be **GRANTED**;

12           **IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED** that the Clerk **FILE** the complaint (ECF No. 1-1);

13           **IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED** that Plaintiff's complaint (ECF No. 1-1) be  
14 **DISMISSED, WITH PREJUDICE**; and

15           **IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED** that this action be **CLOSED** and that judgment  
16 be entered accordingly.

17 **DATED:** June 26, 2020 \_\_\_\_\_.



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE